

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 are presently pending. The subject matter of Claim 21, which has been canceled herein, has been incorporated into the rejected independent claims. The paragraph at page 5, lines 13-19 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error. More particularly, the conversion of 0.06 inches in line 14 should be 1.52 mm and not 1.52 cm. No new matter has been added.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected Claims 17-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dinan *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,212,898).

Independent Claim 17 has been amended to recite the limitations of dependent Claim 21, which has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Thus, Claims 17-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 22 has been amended to include limitations similar to those set forth in allowable dependent Claim 21. Thus, Claim 22 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10, 12-14, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkisian *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,675,923) in view of Cordola *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,173,026).

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the at least two fasteners are movably attached to the overlay, similar to allowable Claim 21. It is respectfully submitted that Sarkisian *et al.* and Cordola *et al.*, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest this limitation. Claims 2-10 and 12-14 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and thus include this patentable distinction.

Independent Claim 22 has been amended similar to Claim 1.

Accordingly, the rejection is believed to be overcome.

The Examiner rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.*, and further in view of admitted prior art (APA).

Claim 11 depends directly from Claim 1, and thus includes the patentable distinction over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.* as discussed above. The alleged APA, which relates to cutting a sign in half and reconnecting it with hinges such that the sign can be folded, fails to remedy the deficiency noted with respect to Sarkisian *et al.* and Cordola *et al.*

Accordingly, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected Claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.*, and further in view of Dinan *et al.*

Claim 15 depends directly from Claim 1, and thus includes the patentable distinction over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.* as discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that Dinan *et al.* fail to remedy the deficiencies of Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.* More specifically, Dinan *et al.* do not disclose fasteners that are movably attached to the overlay.

Independent Claim 16 has been amended to recite that the at least two fasteners are movably attached to the overlay, similar to those limitations set forth in allowable dependent Claim 21. It is respectfully submitted that Sarkisian *et al.*, Cordola *et al.*, and Dinan *et al.*, taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest this limitation.

Accordingly, the rejection is believed to be overcome.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner stated that Claim 21 was "objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

As set forth above, the limitations of Claim 21, which has been canceled herein, have been incorporated into independent Claims 1, 16, 17, and 22.


The Examiner is respectfully thanked for the allowance of Claims 23-32.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By   
Erik L. Ence  
Registration No. 42,511  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Dated: February 11, 2004  
Concord, Massachusetts 01742-9133